



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

68 Minn. 445, it was held that if the circumstances show a probability of a mistake on the part of the company, the conductor will not be justified in ejecting him without further inquiry.

CHECK—LIABILITY OF DRAWER—PRESENTATION.—EDMISTEN *v.* HERPOLS-HEIMER ET AL., 92 N. W. 138 (NEB.).—In the absence of special circumstances, in order to hold the drawer liable on his check, *held*, that it must be presented not later than the day following its receipt, provided the payee receives it in the same place in which the bank is located upon which it is drawn. Sedgwick, J., *dissenting*.

The present tendency of the courts, as indicated by the Negotiable Instruments Law, *New York Laws 1897*, Chap. 612, is to require presentation within a reasonable time, determined by the facts in each case. *Grafton Nat. Bank v. Buckhannon Nat. Bank*, 80 Md. 475; *Robinson v. Ames*, 20 Johns. 146. Although supported by some authority the decision in the case in hand would seem arbitrary and not according to the best decisions. *Smith v. Jones*, 20 Wend. 192; *Gowan v. Jackson*, 20 Johns. 176.

CONSIDERATION—PAYMENT OF DEBT OF THIRD PARTY—PROMISE TO REPAY.—THOMSON ET AL. *v.* THOMSON, 78 N. Y. SUPP. 389.—Plaintiffs being under no obligation to pay defendant's debt, did so without request but were afterwards promised reimbursement by defendant. *Held*, plaintiff could not recover on subsequent promise as it was without consideration.

The English cases relied on decide instances where the promise is based on a mere moral obligation and do not refer to cases where one does what another was legally bound to do. *Eastwood v. Kenyon*, 11 Adolph. & E. 438. The text writers support the proposition that where one pays a debt for another who subsequently promises reimbursement the law will imply a previous request. 1 *Parsons, Cont.* 495. All cases directly applicable hold contrary to the finding in this instance. *Doty v. Wilson*, 14 Johns. (N. Y.) 378; *Gleason v. Dyke*, 22 Pick. 390; *Boothe v. Fitzpatrick*, 36 Vt. 681.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—LIMITING HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN.—STATE *v.* BUCHANAN, 70 PAC. 52 (WASH.).—*Held*, a statute providing that no female shall be employed in certain business establishments more than 10 hours in a day, is constitutional.

In *Com. v. Hamilton Mfg. Co.*, 120 Mass. 383, it was held that a statute limiting the hours of labor of women in factories was a valid health regulation. But an almost identical statute was held unconstitutional as restricting liberty of contract in *Ritchie v. People*, 155 Ill. 98. So a statute of Utah limiting hours of labor in mines was upheld in *Holden v. Hardy*, 169 U. S. 366, where it is laid down that a reasonable limitation, necessary for the preservation of health of employes, is within police powers. But *In re Morgan*, 26 Colo. 415, holds that mere fact of probable injury to health of employes is not a valid support for such a statute, where there is no injury to general public. In New York, on ground of protection to public, hours of labor on railroads may be limited; *People v. Phyfe*, 136 N. Y. 554; also in bakeries. *People v. Lochner*, 73 N. Y. App. Div. 120. While impossible to reconcile the decisions, the weight of authority seems to sustain at least such statutes as the one passed upon here. *Tied., Fed. Con. of Pers. and Prop.*, par. 102.